

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented herein.

Claim 1 has been amended by cancelling "inner" and "outer" since the differentiation of the walls occurs about the relation of the Figures 19 and 18. The sealing lip (14) and the center of mass (25) are axially displaced to the sealing disc (3). Furthermore, the sealing lip (14) is supported over the sealing edge (17). Accordingly the sealing lip (14) is angular arranged in the installation. The centrifugal force causes a force component in the direction of the rolling elements (8) on the angularly arranged sealing lip (14) by the rotation. Outgoing from the sealing disc (3) the force component causes a movement clockwise on the sealing lip (14).

Claim 5 has been amended to recite the axial offset (b) arises because of the geometrical construction of the sealing arrangement (1) and the position of the recess (16) in the bearing ring (9).

Claim 8 has been amended since there is no difference in the bearing ring (9) of claims 1 and 8. Therefore, it is believed the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph have been overcome.


Claims 1 to 3, 5, 6, 8 to 10 and 14 have been rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by the Ohata et al patent which according to the Examiner discloses a similar device comprising an elastic sealing disk running around with an outer bearing ring or a housing having a reinforcement and positionally fixed with positive engagement in a receptacle or an annular groove.

Applicants traverse this ground of rejection since the Ohata et al patent does not anticipate or render obvious Applicants' application which refers to a sealing for a bearing with a preliminary tension dependent on speed or support of the sealing lips. This is reached by the mounting position and the construction of the sealing lip whereby the support force in the mounting position decreases with increasing speed.

The Ohata et al patent does not show a suitable mounting position and sealing lip construction similar to Applicants and apparently the Ohata et al installation situation of the sealing causes a revised support force different from Applicants. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above remarks, it is believed that the claims point out Applicants' patentable contribution. Therefore, favorable reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Charles A. Muserlian #19,683
Attorney for Applicants
Tel. 212 302 8989

CAM:mlp
Enclosures